

jurisdiction is ceded and no longer." The United States leased a certain parcel of this area to the City of Brooklyn "to be used only as a stand for the market wagons bringing produce into the city." The Court held that "the land in question here was clearly not used by the United States and occupied by it for a navy yard or naval hospital * * * the exclusive authority of the United States over the land covered by the lease was at least suspended whilst the lease remained in force."³

54. Old Point Comfort Hotel case—Use considered private.—The Commonwealth of Virginia ceded certain lands at Old Point Comfort to the United States with exclusive jurisdiction over the same "for the purpose of fortification and other objects of national defense." Under authority subsequently granted by the General Assembly, a portion of the area was leased by the United States to private interests for the construction and operation of a hotel. In a case involving the application of certain of the State's lien laws, the United States District Court held that such laws were not applicable within the hotel site because, the property having been leased for hotel purposes, jurisdiction had reverted in the Commonwealth.⁴ The Court observed, "It is evident that this act contemplated the use of land simply for a fort, and that its use for any other purpose should cause a reverter both of title and jurisdiction."

55. Hot Springs, Arkansas, Hotel case—Use considered public.—In another case involving the operation by private interests of a hotel on Government-owned lands, the Supreme Court of the United States held that the land was within the jurisdiction of the United States. In that case the State of Arkansas ceded to the United States exclusive jurisdiction over the Hot Springs Military Reservation which embraced a small hospital site and a contiguous parcel on which a hotel was being operated under a lease from the United States. The Court held that this hospital and hotel site were within the jurisdiction of the United States because of the Federal purpose to which the springs and hospital were devoted, and that they properly included the hotel which was operated for the convenience of persons seeking the benefit of the springs, and offered means whereby the public might be aided by surplus water not needed by the hospital.⁵

56. Jurisdiction over rights-of-way within lands of United States.—The grant of rights-of-way for highway or other purposes traversing lands of the United States does not deprive the Federal Government of jurisdiction over the lands covered by such rights-of-way. Congress granted a right-of-way for rail-

³ *Palmer v. Barrett*, 162 U. S. 399, 404, 16 S. Ct. 837. *People v. Vendome Service Ins.*, 12 N. Y. S. (2) 183.

⁴ *Crook Horner & Co. v. Old Point Comfort Hotel Co.*, 54 Fed. 604.

⁵ *Arlington Hotel Co. v. Fant*, 278 U. S. 439, 49 S. Ct. 227.